

ON THE ASYMPTOTIC LINEARITY OF REDUCTION NUMBER

DANCHENG LU

ABSTRACT. Let R be a standard graded Noetherian algebra over an infinite field K and M a finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded R -module. Then for any graded ideal $I \subseteq R_+$ of R , we show that there exist integers $e_1 \geq e_2$ such that $r(I^n M) = \rho_I(M)n + e_1$ and $D(I^n M) = \rho_I(M)n + e_2$ for $n \gg 0$. Here $r(M)$ and $D(M)$ denote the reduction number of M and the maximal degree of minimal generators of M respectively, and $\rho_I(M)$ is an integer determined by both M and I . We introduce the notion of generalized regularity function Γ for a standard graded algebra over a Noetherian ring and prove that $\Gamma(I^n M)$ is also a linear function in n for $n \gg 0$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Unless otherwise stated, we always assume that $R = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} R_n$ is a standard graded Noetherian algebra over an infinite field K , where “standard graded” means that $R_0 = K$ and $R = K[R_1]$. As usual, an element in R_1 is called a *linear form* of R . Let M be a finitely generated nonzero $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded R -module.

Definition 1.1. A graded ideal J of R is called an *M -reduction* if J is generated by linear forms such that $(JM)_n = M_n$ for $n \gg 0$; An M -reduction is called *minimal* if it does not contain any other M -reduction. The *reduction number* of M with respect to J is defined to be

$$r_J(M) := \max\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : (JM)_n \neq M_n\}.$$

The *reduction number* of M is

$$r(M) := \min\{r_J(M) : J \text{ is a minimal } M\text{-reduction}\}.$$

Let I be a graded ideal of R . In this paper, we are interested in the following natural problem : is $r(I^n M)$ a linear function of n for all $n \gg 0$? This problem is inspired by the asymptotic behaviour of the so-called Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity $\text{reg}(I^n M)$. It was first shown in [2] and [7] for the case R being a polynomial ring over a field, and then in [10] for the general case (namely, when R is a standard graded algebra over a Noetherian ring with unity) that $\text{reg}(I^n M)$ is a linear function of n for all $n \gg 0$. Since the reduction number $r(I^n M)$ is less than or equal to the Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity $\text{reg}(I^n M)$ by [9, Proposition 3.2], it is bounded above by a linear function of n .

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 13D45; Secondary 13C99.

Key words and phrases. Reduction number, Asymptotic linearity, Generalized regularity function.

One of the main obstacles to tackle this question lies in the fact that the reduction number is not a homological invariant. Hence we can not detect any relations among the reduction numbers of modules M_i from the short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow M_2 \rightarrow M_3 \rightarrow 0$. However we find that if both M and N share the same dimension, then $r(N) \leq r(M)$ provided that N is a quotient module of M . It turns out that this simple fact plays an important role.

To state our main result, we introduce some notation. Assume that M is a finitely generated nonzero $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded R -module. We then use $D(M)$ and $d(M)$ to denote the largest and least degrees of a minimal system of generators of M respectively. In other words:

$$D(M) := \max\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : (M/R_+M)_n \neq 0\} \text{ and } d(M) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : M_n \neq 0\}.$$

Let J be a graded ideal contained in I . Recall that J is an M -reduction of I if $JI^nM = I^{n+1}M$ for some $n > 0$. Note that we do not require that J is generated by linear forms in this definition, hence this concept is different from the notion of M -reduction given in Definition 1.1, even though one can show that $JR_+^nM = R_+^nM$ for $n \gg 0$ if and only if $(JM)_n = M_n$ for $n \gg 0$. The integer $\rho_I(M)$ is defined to be:

$$\rho_I(M) := \min\{D(J) : J \text{ is an } M\text{-reduction of } I\}.$$

We answer our question in positivity by showing:

Theorem 1.2 (Main Theorem). *There exist integers $e_1 \geq e_2 \geq d(M)$ such that $r(I^nM) = \rho_I(M)n + e_1$ and $D(I^nM) = \rho_I(M)n + e_2$ for $n \gg 0$.*

Combining this result with the main result in [10] we see that $\text{reg}(I^nM), r(I^nM)$ and $D(I^nM)$ are all linear functions of n with the same slope.

Finally, we introduce the notion of a *generalized regularity function* (see Definition 2.10) for a standard graded algebra over a Noetherian ring with unity, which generalizes the notion of regularity function defined in [6]. We prove:

Theorem 1.3. *Assume that R is a standard graded algebra over a Noetherian ring with unity. Let I be a graded ideal of R and M a finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded R -module, and let Γ be a generalized regularity function for R . Then there exists an integer $e \geq d(M)$ such that $\Gamma(I^nM) = \rho_I(M)n + e$ for $n \gg 0$.*

We remark that the main result of [10] is a special case of Theorem 1.3.

2. ASYMPTOTIC LINEARITY

In this section we will keep the assumptions and notation in the preceding section and introduce one more notion needed. A linear form $y_1 \in R_1$ is called *filter regular* on M if $0 :_M y$ is a module of finite length. A sequence $y_1, \dots, y_r$ with $y_i \in R_1$ is called a *filter regular sequence* on M if y_i is filter regular on $M/(y_1, \dots, y_{i-1})M$ for all $i = 1, \dots, r$.

Let $\dim(M)$ denote the Krull dimension of M . We collect some basic properties of a reduction number in the following two results.

Lemma 2.1. *Let J be an M -reduction. Then:*

- (a) $r_J(M) \geq D(M)$;
- (b) $r_J(M) = \min\{n \geq D(M) : (JM)_{n+1} = M_{n+1}\}$;
- (c) $r_J(M(-p)) = r_J(M) + p$ for all $p \in \mathbb{Z}$;
- (d) if $\dim(M) > 0$ and $n \geq r_J(M)$, then $r_J(M_{\geq n}) = n$;
- (e) if $\dim(M) > 0$, then $r_J(M) = \min\{n : r_J(M_{\geq n}) = n\}$.

Proof. (a) Since $JM \subseteq R_+M$, we have $(R_+M)_n = M_n$ for all $n \geq r_J(M) + 1$. Hence $D(M) \leq r_J(M)$.

(b) Set $r = \min\{n \geq D(M) : (JM)_{n+1} = M_{n+1}\}$. Since $r \geq D(M)$, we have $D(JM) \leq r + 1$, and so $(JM)_{m+1} = M_{m+1}$ for any $m \geq r$. This implies $r_J(M) \leq r$. The inequality $r \leq r_J(M)$ follows from $r_J(M) \in \{n \geq D(M) : (JM)_{n+1} = M_{n+1}\}$.

(c) $r_J(M(-p)) = \max\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : (JM(-p))_n \neq M(-p)_n\} = \max\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : (JM)_{n-p} \neq M_{n-p}\} = \max\{n + p \in \mathbb{Z} : (JM)_n \neq M_n\} = r_J(M) + p$.

For the proof of (d) and (e), we first notice that for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $(JM)_k = J_1M_{k-1} + J_1R_1M_{k-2} + \cdots = J_1M_{k-1}$. In particular, $(JM)_{k+i} = (JM_{\geq k})_{k+i}$ for all $i \geq 1$.

(d) Since $n \geq D(M)$, the module $M_{\geq n}$ is generated in degree n . In particular $M_n = (M_{\geq n})_n \neq 0$ (for if $M_n = 0$ then $M_{\geq n} = 0$, so $\dim(M) = 0$, a contradiction). This implies $r_J(M_{\geq n}) \geq n$ since $(JM_{\geq n})_n = 0$. For all $i \geq 1$, we have $(JM_{\geq n})_{n+i} = (JM)_{n+i} = M_{n+i} = (M_{\geq n})_{n+i}$. Hence $r_J(M_{\geq n}) \leq n$.

(e) Set $r = \min\{n : r_J(M_{\geq n}) = n\}$. Then $r \leq r_J(M)$ by (d). Since $r_J(M_{\geq r}) = r$, we have $(JM)_{r+i} = (JM_{\geq r})_{r+i} = (M_{\geq r})_{r+i} = M_{r+i}$ for all $i \geq 1$, so $r_J(M) \leq r$. $\square$

Lemma 2.2. *Assume that $\dim(M) = d$ and let J be an M -reduction. Then*

- (a) J is generated by at least d linear forms;
- (b) if $y_1, \dots, y_d$ is a filter regular sequence on M , then $Q = (y_1, \dots, y_d)$ is a minimal M -reduction. In particular, for generic linear forms $y_1, \dots, y_d$, $Q = (y_1, \dots, y_d)$ is a minimal M -reduction.

Proof. (a) Note that $\dim(M/JM) = 0$, one then uses e.g. [1, Proposition A.4].

(b) From the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow 0_M : y_1 \rightarrow M(-1) \rightarrow M \rightarrow M/y_1M \rightarrow 0$, we see that $\dim(M/y_1M) = \dim(M) - 1$, by comparing the degrees of Hilbert polynomials of M and M/y_1M . Hence $\dim(M/QM) = 0$. It follows that Q is an M -reduction and it is minimal by (a). The last statement follows from [3, Lemma 4.3.1], which says a generic linear form is filter regular on M . $\square$

Next, we will show that $r(M)$ is the reduction number of M with respect to any generic minimal reduction, along a similar line as given in [8]. For this, we introduce some notation and some basic facts. Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We use t_n for the dimension of the K -space M_n and fix a K -basis, denoted by T_i , of M_n . Let $x_1, \dots, x_m$ be a K -basis of R_1 . Then for any ideal J of R generated by d linear forms: $y_1, \dots, y_d$,

there exists a matrix $\alpha = (\alpha_{i,j}) \in K^{d \times m}$, such that

$$y_i = \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_{i,j} x_j$$

for $i = 1, \dots, d$. We call α the *parameterized matrix* of J .

For $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, the vector space $(JM)_n = J_1 M_{n-1}$ is spanned by vectors $y_i g$, with $g \in T_{n-1}$ and $1 \leq i \leq d$. Let $\mathbb{M}_n(\alpha)$ denote the matrix of coefficients of those elements written as linear combinations of elements in T_n . Then J is a minimal M -reduction if and only if $d = \dim(M)$ and there exists $n \geq D(M)$ such that $\text{rank } \mathbb{M}_{n+1}(\alpha) = t_{n+1}$ in view of Lemma 2.1(b). In this case:

$$r_J(M) = \min\{n \geq D(M) : \text{rank } \mathbb{M}_{n+1}(\alpha) = t_{n+1}\}.$$

Proposition 2.3. *Suppose that $\dim(M) = d$. Then for generic linear forms $y_1, \dots, y_d$ of R , we have $r(M) = r_{(y_1, \dots, y_d)}(M)$.*

Proof. Step 1: Let $U = (u_{i,j})_{d \times m}$ be a matrix of indeterminates, and set

$$R_U = R \otimes_K K(U) \text{ and } M_U = M \otimes_K K(U),$$

where $K(U)$ is the fractional field of the polynomial ring $K[U] = K[u_{i,j} : 1 \leq i \leq d, 1 \leq j \leq m]$. Then R_U is a standard graded algebra over $K(U)$ and M_U is a finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded R_U -module. Note that the K -basis T_n of M_n is also a K_U -basis of $(M_U)_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and that the K -basis $x_1, \dots, x_m$ of R_1 is also a $K(U)$ -basis of $(R_U)_1$.

Set $z_i = \sum_{j=1}^m u_{ij} x_j \in (R_U)_1$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$. We claim that $z_1, \dots, z_d$ is a filter regular sequence on M_U . In fact, let P be an associated prime ideal of M_U with $P \not\subseteq (R_U)_+$. Since $P = pR_U$ for some associated prime ideal p of M , we see that if $z_1 \in P$, then $x_i \in p$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$, and so $P \supseteq (R_U)_+$, a contradiction. Hence z_1 is filter regular on M_U . By induction, $z_1, \dots, z_d$ is a filter regular sequence on M_U , as claimed. Therefore $(z_1, \dots, z_d)$ is a minimal M_U -reduction by Lemma 2.2(b).

Step 2: For $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define the matrix $\mathbb{M}_n(U)$ similarly as $\mathbb{M}_n(\alpha)$, that is, $\mathbb{M}_n(U)$ is the matrix of coefficients of elements $z_i g$ with $1 \leq i \leq d$ and $g \in T_{n-1}$ written as linear combinations of elements in T_n . It is not hard to see $\mathbb{M}_n(\alpha)$ is a specialization of $\mathbb{M}_n(U)$.

Step 3: We show that

$$r(M) = r_{(z_1, \dots, z_d)} M_U = \min\{n \geq D(M_U) (= D(M)) : \text{rank } \mathbb{M}_{n+1}(U) = t_{n+1}\}.$$

The second equality follows from the discussion before this lemma. Put $r = r_{(z_1, \dots, z_d)} M_U$. Then $\text{rank } \mathbb{M}_{r+1}(U) = t_{r+1}$. Since K is an infinite field, there exists a matrix $\alpha \in K^{d \times m}$ such that $\text{rank } \mathbb{M}_n(\alpha) = \text{rank } \mathbb{M}_n(U)$. This implies $r(M) \leq r$. On the other hand, it is clear that $\text{rank } \mathbb{M}_n(U) \geq \text{rank } \mathbb{M}_n(\alpha)$ for any $\alpha \in K^{d \times m}$. Hence $r(M) = r$.

Step 4: Let $f(U)$ be a nonzero t_{r+1} -minor of $\mathbb{M}_{r+1}(U)$. Then any $\alpha \in K^{d \times m}$ with $f(\alpha) \neq 0$ corresponds to a minimal reduction J such that $r_J(M) = r(M)$. $\square$

Corollary 2.4. *Let $M_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ be finitely generated nonzero $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded R -modules with the same dimension d .*

- (a) *If $M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ is an epimorphism of graded modules, then $r(M_1) \geq r(M_2)$;*
- (b) *$r(\oplus_{i=1}^n M_i) = \max\{r(M_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$;*
- (c) *If $0 \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow M_2 \rightarrow M_3 \rightarrow 0$ is a short exact sequence of graded modules, then: $r(M_3) \leq r(M_2) \leq \max\{r(M_1), r(M_3)\}$.*

Proof. (a) In view of Proposition 2.3, there exists a sequence of linear forms $y_1, \dots, y_d$ such that the ideal $Q := (y_1, \dots, y_d)$ is an M_i -reduction and $r(M_i) = r_Q(M_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Since $r_Q(M_i) = \max\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : (M_i/QM_i)_n \neq 0\}$, our inequality follows from the epimorphism: $M_1/QM_1 \rightarrow M_2/QM_2$, which is obtained by the right exactness of the functor $\otimes$.

(b) Set $N = \oplus_{i=1}^n M_i$. There exists an ideal of R , say Q , generated by d linear forms, such that $r(N) = r_Q(N)$ and $r(M_i) = r_Q(M_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ by Proposition 2.3. Since $N/QN \cong \oplus_{i=1}^n M_i/QM_i$, our equality follows.

(c) Let Q be an ideal such that $r(M_i) = r_Q(M_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ by Proposition 2.3. It follows from the exact sequence $M_1/QM_1 \rightarrow M_2/QM_2 \rightarrow M_3/QM_3 \rightarrow 0$ that $r(M_2) \leq \max\{r(M_1), r(M_3)\}$. The first inequality has been proved in (a). $\square$

It is known that the Krull dimension $\dim(M/I^n M)$ keeps constant as n grows since $\sqrt{\text{Ann}(M/I^n M)} (= \sqrt{I^n + \text{Ann}(M)})$ is independent of n . But this is not the case for $\dim(I^n M)$. For instance, let $R = K[x, y]$, $M = R/(x^2)$ and $I = (x)$. Then $\dim(I^2 M) = 0$ but $\dim(IM) = 1$.

Lemma 2.5. *The function $\dim(I^n M)$ is constant for $n \gg 0$*

Proof. Put $d = \dim(M/I^n M)$ and $d_1 = \dim(M)$. By [5, Theorem 1.1], for $i = 0, \dots, d$, the Hilbert coefficient $e_i(M/I^n M)$ of $M/I^n M$ is a polynomial in n for $n \gg 0$. Let $P_N(x)$ denote the Hilbert polynomial of a graded module N , namely, $P_N(x)$ is a polynomial such that $P_N(n) = \sum_{i \leq n} \dim_K(N_i)$ for $n \gg 0$. Set $c = d_1 - d \geq 0$. Then $P_{I^n M}(x)$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^c (-1)^i e_i(M) \binom{x + d_1 - i}{d_1 - i} + \sum_{i=1}^d (-1)^i [e_{c+i}(M) - e_i(M/I^n M)] \binom{x + d - i}{d - i}$$

Since every nonzero polynomial has finite zeroes (in $\mathbb{Z}$), the degree of $P_{I^n M}(x)$ stabilizes if n is large enough. Hence $\dim(I^n M)$ is constant for $n \gg 0$. $\square$

We record [8, Lemma 3.1] in the following lemma. Note that in this result we only require that R_0 is a Noetherian ring with unity.

Lemma 2.6. $D(I^n M) \geq \rho_I(M)n + d(M)$.

In the following lemma we will present an useful exact sequence of graded modules, which is an improvement of the exact sequence appeared in the proof of [1, Theorem 4.7.6]. Let $[t]$ denote the set of integers $\{1, \dots, t\}$.

Lemma 2.7. *Let J be an M -reduction of I and assume that J is minimally generated by $u_1, \dots, u_t$ with $\deg u_i = p_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$. Then for all $n \gg 0$, we have the*

following exact sequence of graded modules:

$$0 \rightarrow I^{n-t}M(-\sum_{i=1}^t p_i) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \bigoplus_{T \subseteq [t], |T|=i} I^{n-i}M(-\sum_{j \in T} p_j) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow I^n M \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. Let $K. = K.(u_1, \dots, u_t; M)$ be the Koszul complex and ∂ be its differential. Since $\partial(K_{i+1}) \subseteq IK_i$ for each i , we have the following subcomplex of $K.$ for all integer $n \geq t$:

$$K.^{(n)} : 0 \rightarrow I^{n-t}K_t \rightarrow I^{n-t+1}K_{t-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow I^{n-1}K_1 \rightarrow I^n K_0 \rightarrow 0.$$

We will show that $K.^{(n)}$ is exact for $n \gg 0$ (and thus our result follows.)

Fix $m > 0$ such that $J I^m M = I^{m+1} M$. Then $I^{n-i} K_i = J^{n-i-m} I^m K_i$ and by Artin-Rees Lemma it follows that

$$Z_i(K.^{(n)}) = I^{n-i} K_i \cap Z_i(K.) = J(J^{n-i-m-1} I^m K_i \cap Z_i(K.))$$

for $i = 0, \dots, t$ and for $n \gg 0$.

Now given n large enough such that the equalities above hold simultaneously. Let $a \in Z_i(K.^{(n)})$. Then $a = \sum_{j=1}^t u_j a_j$ with $a_j \in J^{n-i-m-1} I^m K_{t-i} \cap Z_i(K.)$. Let $e_1, \dots, e_t$ be a K -basis of $K_1(u_1, \dots, u_t; R)$ with $\partial_R(e_j) = u_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, t$. Here ∂_R denotes the differential of $K_1(u_1, \dots, u_t; R)$. Then $w = \sum_{j=1}^t e_j a_j \in I^{n-i-1} K_{i+1}$ and $\partial(w) = a - \sum_{j=1}^t e_j \partial(a_j) = a$ by [1, Proposition 1.6.2]. Thus $K.^{(n)}$ is indeed exact. $\square$

Remark 2.8. (1) Artin-Rees Lemma says that if N is a submodule of M then there exists an integer $m > 0$ such that $I^n M \cap N = I^{n-m}(I^m M \cap N)$ for all $n > m$. However the assumption that N is a submodule of M is not essential. In fact, if N is not a submodule of M then $I^n M \cap N = I^n M \cap (N \cap M) = I^{n-m}(I^m M \cap (N \cap M)) = I^{n-m}(I^m M \cap N)$ for all $n > m$. Therefore Artin-Rees Lemma still holds. We use Artin-Rees Lemma of this version in the proof of Lemma 2.7.

(2) The first epimorphism in the exact sequence of Lemma 2.7 :

$$\rightarrow \bigoplus_{j=1}^t I^{n-1} M(-p_j) \rightarrow I^n M \rightarrow 0$$

can be seen directly: if n is large enough, then $I^n M = J I^{n-1} M = u_1 I^{n-1} M + \cdots + u_t I^{n-1} M$. Thus the desired map can be obtained by compounding the homogeneous surjective maps: $I^{n-1} M(-p_j) \rightarrow u_j I^{n-1} M$, which is defined by: $a \mapsto u_j a$.

(3) In view of its proof we do not require that R_0 is a field in this lemma; it holds even when R_0 is a Noetherian ring with unity.

We now in the position to prove the main result of this paper.

Theorem 2.9. *There exist integers $e_1 \geq e_2 \geq d(M)$ such that $r(I^n M) = \rho_I(M)n + e_1$ and $D(I^n M) = \rho_I(M)n + e_2$ for $n \gg 0$.*

Proof. Let $Q_n = r(I^n M) - \rho_I(M)n$. Then $Q_n \geq d(M)$ by Lemma 2.6 together with Lemma 2.1(a). Let J be an M -reduction of I such that $D(J) = \rho_I(M)$. Considering the epimorphism in Remark 2.8(2), we have $r(I^n M) \leq \max\{r(I^{n-1} M) + p_i : 1 \leq$

$i \leq t\}$ by Lemma 2.5 and Corollary 2.4. Here $\rho_I(M) = \max\{p_i: 1 \leq i \leq t\}$. It follows that $Q_n \leq Q_{n-1}$ for $n \gg 0$ and so Q_n is eventually constant with a value $e_1 \geq d(M)$. This proves that $r(I^n M) = \rho_I(M)n + e_1$ for $n \gg 0$.

For the proof of the second equality, we notice the following easy facts:

- (1) If N is a quotient module of M then $D(N) \leq D(M)$;
- (2) $D(\oplus_{i=1}^n M_i) = \max\{D(M_i): 1 \leq i \leq n\}$
- (3) $D(M(-p)) = D(M) + p$ for $p \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Using those facts instead of Lemma 2.5 and Corollary 2.4 in the proof of the first equality, we obtain there exists $e_2 \geq d(M)$ such that $D(I^n M) = \rho_I(M)n + e_2$ for $n \gg 0$. Finally, the inequality $e_1 \geq e_2$ follows from Lemma 2.1(a). $\square$

We conclude this paper with another application of Lemma 2.7. First we change our setting. From now on, let $R = \oplus_{n \geq 0} R_n$ be a standard graded Noetherian algebra over $R_0 = A$, where A is a Noetherian ring with unity. We denote by $\mathcal{M}_R$ the category of finitely generated graded R -modules.

Definition 2.10. A *generalized regularity function* for R is a function Γ which assigns each $M \in \mathcal{M}_R$ an integer $\Gamma(M)$ such that for all $M, N, P \in \mathcal{M}_R$, one has:

- (1) if $M \cong N$, then $\Gamma(M) = \Gamma(N)$;
- (2) $\Gamma(M(-p)) = \Gamma(M) + p$ for all $p \in \mathbb{Z}$;
- (3) $\Gamma(M) \geq D(M)$;
- (4) $\Gamma(M \oplus N) = \max\{\Gamma(M), \Gamma(N)\}$,
- (5) if $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow P \rightarrow 0$ is a short exact sequence of graded modules, then $\Gamma(P) \leq \max\{\Gamma(N), \Gamma(M) - 1\}$.

This concept generalizes the notion of regularity function defined in [6] in two hands. Firstly we do not require that R_0 is field; Secondly, some requirements in the definition of regularity function (see [6, Definition 1.1]) are dropped. Note that the condition that $\Gamma(M) \geq D(M)$ in our definition does not appear in [6, Definition 1.1], but it can be deduced from that in view of [6, Proposition 1.2(a)]. We begin with:

Lemma 2.11. Let $0 \rightarrow M_t \rightarrow M_{t-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow M_0 \rightarrow 0$ be an exact sequence of graded modules. Then $\Gamma(M_0) \leq \max\{\Gamma(M_1), \Gamma(M_2) - 1, \dots, \Gamma(M_t) - t + 1\}$.

Proof. Split the exact sequence into the $(t-1)$ short exact sequences and apply the fifth condition of Definition 2.10 to those sequences. $\square$

In the proof of our last result we will use the same strategy as in the proof of [7, Theorem 5].

Theorem 2.12. Let I be a graded ideal of R and $M \in \mathcal{M}_R$, and let Γ be a generalized regularity function for R . Then there exists an integer $e \geq d(M)$ such that $\Gamma(I^n M) = \rho_I(M)n + e$ for $n \gg 0$

Proof. Put $P = \rho_I(M)$ and let $Q_n = \Gamma(I^n M) - nP$. Then $Q_n \geq d(M)$ by Lemma 2.6 and the third condition in Definition 2.10. Let J be an M -reduction of I such that $D(J) = \rho_I(M)$. Apply Lemma 2.11 to the exact sequence in Lemma 2.7 (see

Remark 2.8(3)), we have: $Pn + Q_n$

$$\leq \max\{(n-1)P + Q_{n-1} + P, (n-2)P + Q_{n-2} + 2P - 1, \dots, (n-t)P + Q_{n-t} + tP - t + 1\}.$$

It follows that $Q_n \leq \max\{Q_{n-1}, Q_{n-2} - 1, \dots, Q_{n-t} - t + 1\}$ for $n \gg 0$. Put $T_n = \max\{Q_{n-1}, Q_{n-2}, \dots, Q_{n-t}\}$. Then $T_{n+1} \leq T_n$ for $n \gg 0$ and so T_n is eventually constant with a value $e \geq d(M)$. Let m be an integer such that $T_n = e$ for all $n \geq m$. We claim that $Q_n = e$ for all $n \geq m$.

Assume on the contrary that $Q_m \neq e$. Since $Q_n \leq T_n$, we have $Q_m < e$. It follows that $Q_{m+1} \leq \max\{Q_m, Q_{m-1} - 1, \dots, Q_{m-t+1} - t + 1\} \leq \max\{Q_m, T_m - 1\} < e$. Thus $Q_n < e$ for all $n \geq m$ by induction, a contradiction. Hence $Q_m = e$ and in the same reason we have $Q_n = e$ for all $n \geq m$, as claimed. This implies $\Gamma(I^n M) = Pn + e$ for all $n \gg 0$. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Bruns, J. Herzog, *Cohen-Macaulay rings*, Cambridges Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 39, 1993.
- [2] S.D. Cutkosky, J. Herzog, N.V. Trung, *Asymptotic behaviour of the Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity*, Compositio Math. 118 (1999), 243-261.
- [3] J. Herzog, T. Hibi, *Monomial Ideals*, Graduate Text in Mathematics, Springer, 2011.
- [4] J. Herzog, L.T. Hoa, N.V. Trung, *Asymptotic linear bounds of the Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity*, Trans. A.M.S. 354 (2002), 1793-1809
- [5] J. Herzog, T. Puthenpurakal, J.K. Verma, *Hilbert polynomials and powers of ideals*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Math. Soc. 145 (2008), 623 - 642.
- [6] J. Herzog, G. Resuccia, *Regularity functions for homogeneous algebra*, Arch. Math. 76 (2001), 100-108
- [7] V. Kodiyalam, *Asymptotic behaviour of Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity*, Proc. A.M.S. 128 (2000), 407-411
- [8] N.V. Trung, *Constructive characterization of the reduction numbers*, Compositio Math. 137 (2003), 99-113
- [9] N.V. Trung, *Reduction exponent and degree bound for the defining equations of graded rings*, Proc. A.M.S. 101 (1987) 229-236.
- [10] N.V. Trung, Hsin-Ju Wang, *On the asymptotic linearity of Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity*, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra 201 (2005), 42-48

DANCHENG LU, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SOOCHOW UNIVERSITY, 215006 SUZHOU, P.R.CHINA

E-mail address: ludancheng@suda.edu.cn